This feature is neither described nor even faintly suggested by Stevens.

Examiner takes the position that Applicant's "first and second source terminal" may be equated to Stevens' terminals 12a and 12b. However, that position is manifestly non-appropos, especially in view of the newly added recitation to the effect that the AC voltage is of frequency distinctly higher than that of the power line voltage.

Stevens' terminals 12a and 12b are connected with the "AC line"; which means that there is indeed an AC voltage provided between his terminals 12a and 12b. However, as would be very well known by a person possessing but ordinary skill in the particular art pertinent hereto (i.e., a "skilled artisan"), both of the conductors of an AC power line have "substantial galvanic connection" with earth ground. Therefore, neither of Stevens' terminals 12a and 12b may be characterized as having "substantially no galvanic connection" with ground.

Moreover, even in the absence of the AC power line, Stevens terminals 12a and 12b are galvanically connected with each other, therefore making it impossible for one of the terminals to be galvanically connected with earth ground without also having the other terminal galvanically connected with earth ground -- or vice versa.

In other words, for Examiner to equate Stevens' terminals 12a and 12b with Applicant's "first and second source terminal" is totally and utterly non-appropos.

(b) Exemplary claim 26 now includes:

"a second circuit assembly ... operative automatically to cause the RMS magnitude of the AC voltage to be higher after lamp ignition as compared with before lamp ignition".

This feature is neither described nor even faintly suggested by Stevens. That is, it is simply not present in the Stevens circuit -- inherently or otherwise.

As a skilled artisan would know very well, in any usual ballast arrangement (such as that of Stevens), the RMS magnitude of the voltage across a gas discharge lamp is lower after lamp ignition as compared with before lamp ignition -- this being so because the magnitude of the voltage required to ignite the lamp is far higher than the magnitude of the voltage required to sustain lamp current after ignition.

Thus, there would be no obvious reason for the magnitude of the voltage of the source (that supplies the current to the lamp) to be higher after lamp ignition as compared with before lamp ignition.

(c) Exemplary claim 27 now includes:

"a second sub-circuit ... operative to provide an AC voltage ... characterized by having a fundamental period: (i) during a first part of which its instantaneous magnitude remains ... constant at a first given level; and (ii) during a second part of which its instantaneous magnitude remains ... constant at a second given level, the second part having a total duration ... equal to that of the first part as well as distinctly shorter than half the total duration of the whle fundamental period, each transistion between the two levels taking place in a gradual and continuous manner".

This feature is neither described nor even faintly suggested by Stevens.

In Stevens, except when operating at a reduced light output level, the waveshape of his inverter output voltage is a plain squarewave. When he is operating at a reduced output level, the waveshape of his inverter output voltage is a "shouldered" squarewave; which is to say, a waveform like that shown just below:

In other words, nowhere in Stevens is there to be found an AC voltage "characterized by having a fundamental period: (i) during a first part of which its instantaneous magnitude remains ... constant at a first given level; and (ii) during a second part of which its instantaneous magnitude remains ... constant at a second given level, the second part having a total duration ... equal to that of the first part as well as distinctly shorter than half the total duration of the whle fundamental period, each transistion between the two levels taking place in a gradual and continuous manner".

(d) Exemplary claim 32 includes the same recitation as quoted above in connection with claim 26; and the very same arguments apply in support of the allowability of claim 32.

However, claim 32 <u>additionally</u> includes:

"physical structure combining the three sub-circuits and the gas discharge lamp in such manner as to result in a single substantially rigid physical structure characterized by <u>having a protruding threaded portion adapted to be screwed into and held by an ordinary Edison-type lamp socket</u>.

This feature is neither described nor even faintly suggested by Stevens.

Moreover, there is nothing whatsoever in the cited prior art that, even in the most remote manner, suggests the invention defined in exemplary claim 32.

(e) Regarding claims 31 and 33-38, reference is made to the arguments presented in Section (d) above; all of which arguments pertain to claims 31 and 33-38 as well.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Regarding claims 31-38, there is nothing whatsoever in the cited prior art that even faintly suggests the subject matter now defined in claims 31-38. More generaly, there is nothing whatsoever in the cited prior art that even faintly suggests anything regarding a screw-in self-ballasted fluorescent lamp, let alone a screw-in fluorescent lamp exhibiting the specific characteristics defined in the claims.

Likewise, regarding claims 22-30, there is nothing whatsoever in the cited prior art that even faint;y suggests the particular subject matter defined by claims 22-30.

Ole K. Nilssen, Pro Se Applicant